DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 147 CG 008 719

AUTHOR	DeAntonio, Emile
TITLE	Evaluation of the Community School Relations Workshop. LASER, 1971-1972.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Mar 73
NOTE	64p.; A few pages of this document will not reproduce clearly
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Agents; *Community Involvement; Educational Innovation; Evaluation; *Program Evaluation; *School Community Relationship; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	LASER; Learning Action Through Social Education Reading

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates the Community-School Relations Workshops, a component of the Learning and Action through Social Education and Reading (LASER) program. The workshops are designed to help school-community representatives to work on problems of mutual concern. The study considers two questions: (1) Assuming the workshop is capable of bringing about positive change in the relationships among individual participants, to what degree can the responsibility for these changes be traced directly to the curriculum materials? (2) Do participants show any evidence of measurable change that appears to go beyond the changes in their relationships to one another? To determine effectiveness of curriculum, short questionnaires were used along with evaluative observation. The primary tool used in measuring changes in perceptions was a pre-program and post-program questionnaire which included a semantic differential section in which participants were asked to rate 10 concepts on 10 scales. Results indicate that there is little evidence of change in participants' perceptions of concepts fundamental to the program or among various groups involved with education. (Author/HMV)

E75.

CG

Library
Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

ED 089147

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016

EVALUATION OF THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL RELATIONS WORKSHOP, IASER, 1971-1972

by

Emile DeAntonio

EVALUATION AND RESEARCH DIVISION

MARCH 1973

CG 008 719

THE PROGRAM

The Community-School Relations (CSR) Workshop is a component of the Learning and Action through Social Education and Reading (LASER) program. The LASER program is directed toward breaking down the walls between the public schools and the communities that they serve. The CSR Workshops are designed to improve school community relations by bringing school personnel together with community representatives to work on problems of mutual concern. The 1972 cycle was the product of the gradual evolution of the component over three previous cycles conducted in 1970-71.* The materials for the most recent cycle listed the following as the objectives of the program:

> To stimulate participants to express their educational philosophy and expectations regarding the relationship between the community and the schools;
>
> To identify and assess the major educational problems existing between the community and the schools in their district(s);
>
> To clarify and understand each participant's perceptions of the existing community-school problems as well as attempt to understand deeper, root causes of those problems;
>
> To encourage participants to jointly seek and plan solutions to the major educational problems that concern the community and the schools.

Previous cycles of the program resulted in the development of a detailed written curriculum based upon the application of problem-solving and group work techniques to such areas of community-school relations as

---

* For a description of the previous cycles, see "Evaluation of the Community School Relations Program, 1970-71." Center for Urban Education Research and Evaluation Division, November 15, 1971.

accountability and parent involvement. The materials consisted of a Workshop Leaders Guide containing detailed session plans for 15 two-hour sessions for use by the Workshop Leaders, and exercises for use by the participants. Although the participants were expected to apply the techniques outlined in the curriculum to problems that they felt to be of interest and concern in their districts, to some extent determining the content of the program themselves, the session plans formed the basic structure of the program. These plans were in the process of being revised and simplified at the beginning of the cycle under consideration. In addition to the curriculum, a Manual of Procedures was developed to guide other institutions in setting up similar programs. Originally, the developers planned to utilize this curriculum in a series of weekly workshop sessions. These were to be held at the Community Learning Centers in School Districts 7 and 14 after formal approval for the implementation of the LASER program was obtained from the districts' Community School Boards.

Forty-six participants were to be recruited in each district and divided into two working groups. The participants were to be selected from parents, union and non-union teachers, paraprofessionals, school administrators, and members of community organizations. In addition, students were to be included in the Workshops for the first time. Community representatives and school personnal were to be equally represented.

Parents, students, paraprofessionals, and members of community organizations were considered to be community representatives.*

The Workshop groups were to be led by consultant staff members of the Center for Urban Education (CUE) experienced in education and group work. The role of the group leader is primarily that of an "enabler" and mediator. He serves to introduce topics for discussion, assists the group in focusing upon important points through questions or through leading the group in the exercise of such techniques as role-play and "fish-bowl," and may serve as an informational resource to the participants. The group leaders were to receive additional training from the Project Director.

However, for reasons which are not clear to us, CUE was not successful in obtaining the cooperation of the Community School Boards. This caused several changes in the plan outlined above. First, waiting for the approval of the Boards delayed the start of the program and ultimately made it necessary for the sessions to be held twice each week in order to complete the program by the end of the school year. In addition, the developers were unable to recruit community school board members, and stated that there were attempts by some school personnel to discourage others from participating.

---

* The program developers of the CSR workshop considered students as both community and school representatives. In evaluating the program, however, we defined them as part of the community group only.

Thus, the program was handicapped from the start in its endeavor to recruit a balanced group of participants.

Methodology

In assessing past cycles of the Community School Relations Workshops we concentrated heavily on formative evaluation, providing extensive feedback to the developers while the program was in progress. This year we decided to turn to a more summative approach since we had already provided extensive feedback on the process and implementation of the program, and the program had reached the stage where the time had come to look at outcomes rather than processes. Furthermore, the developers decided to use other members of the development division to observe each session, and to provide the kind of information that we had previously provided. Nevertheless, we continued to meet with the developers weekly, and contributed our assessment of those sessions that we observed. We also met with the developers to discuss the manual and the curriculum.

Our observation of the previous cycle of the program convinced us that CSR was capable of bringing about positive changes in the relationships between individual participants.

Two questions appeared to spring directly from this conclusion. First, to what degree could the responsibility for these changes be traced directly to the curriculum materials? Work on this aspect of the program had not been possible in earlier cycles because of the extensive curriculum revision that was done concurrently with the actual use of the

materials. Furthermore, prepared session plans were frequently altered or abandoned in response to the participants' desire to discuss problems that were of more immediate interest in their districts. Although we regarded such flexibility as an extremely positive aspect of the program, a continuation of this pattern would suggest that other factors might be as important (or more important) than the curriculum materials in improving the relationships between the participants. If this were the case it seemed possible that additional materials, focusing on these factors would have to be created in order to ensure the replicability of the program. As subsidiary objectives we wished to isolate these factors if possible, and also to begin to investigate whether any specific techniques or topics in the materials appeared to be more effective than others.

The second question that we wished to ask was whether or not the participants showed any evidence of measurable change that appeared to go beyond the changes in their relationships to each other. In other words, was there any evidence of change in the participants' views of the various groups (teachers, parents, paraprofessionals, administrators, and students) represented in the workshops or in their reactions to concepts that appeared to be fundamental to the curriculum. If it could be established that such changes actually took place we would have stronger grounds for believing that the participants' experience in the program would continue to affect their behavior even after their graduation.

In order to determine the extent to which the curriculum was actually used, we asked the group leaders to fill out after each session, a short questionnaire[1] detailing which of the activities, topics, and techniques listed in the session plans were actually utilized, which were omitted, and whether or not any others had been added. In addition, the group leaders were requested to note which activities or topics provoked the greatest and the least response; which representative groups had the highest degree of participation; how relevant the discussion was to the stated objectives of the session; whether or not the expected outcomes were achieved; and what suggestions the group leader had for improving the session.

Observations of approximately 15 percent of the sessions by an evaluation staff member provided an independent check on the group leaders' responses to the questionnaire. The observer concentrated on noting the participants reactions and the degree of departure from the session plans.

In addition, a short questionnaire[2] was administered to the participants after each session. This questionnaire was designed to elicit the participant's views on the importance of the topic; the relevance of the discussion to this topic; the appropriateness of the technique utilized, and how well it was used; the clarity and relevance of any printed materials

---

1 See Appendix II
2 See Appendix I

distributed to the participants; how free the individual felt in participating in the discussion; what they thought were the best and worst things about the session; and their suggestions for improving it. The responses to this questionnaire were also relayed to the Development Staff, and were primarily used as an on-going check of the participants' reactions to the program.

The primary tool used in our attempt to measure changes in the participants perceptions was a preprogram and postprogram questionnaire.[3] The questions focused on such things as the kinds of input into educational decision-making that the participants believed most appropriate for the various groups concerned with education, and the participants' perceptions of the actual roles of these groups and of the educational problems of this district. Because participants were all expected to have a working knowledge of English, the instrument was administered in English only. The questionnaire included a semantic differential section in which participants were asked to rate ten concepts (school professionals, educational change, parent involvement, etc.) on ten scales. Other questions were of the multiple response type, although open-ended questions were included to determine what the respondents believed to be the most pressing educational problems, what solutions to these problems they deemed most workable, and what suggestions they had formed for improving the program. In addition, we gathered demographic data and background information on the respondents' previous activity in educational and community groups.

---

[3] See Appendix III

The pretest was administered to 44 participants and the posttest to 41; 33 persons took both the pretest and the posttest. Background and demographic questions were asked only on the pretest, and the results given are based on the group of 44. There is little difference between the proportions of teachers, administrators, community representatives, etc., who took the pretest and those who took both tests. All comparisons of pretest and posttest data are based on the latter group. All percentages given are inclusive of the "no response" category.

Scrutiny of the data gathered by our instruments revealed several problems. For example, we based our estimate of the participants comprehension of written English on the data gathered during the previous cycle of the program. Since some participants evidenced difficulty in responding to questions with which participants in the previous cycle had had no difficulty, it is possible that our assumption of a similar level of comprehension was erroneous. However, this problem does not appear to have had a crucial effect on our data, although in specific cases it has limited the usefulness of certain questions. A more critical problem lay in the group leaders' rating form. This will be discussed in detail in the section on the curriculum.

Background of the Participants

A total of 62 people attended at least one of the fifteen sessions. Nine of these dropped out (failed to attend the last three consecutive sessions), leaving a total of 23 participants in the Bronx and 30 in

Brooklyn. Of these, a basic nucleus of 20 people in the Bronx and 23 in Brooklyn may be considered to have attended regularly. The remaining ten attended sporadically, being absent for a total of four sessions or more.

The 44 participants to whom the pretest was administered identified themselves as follows: three administrators, nine faculty (one of whom was a U.F.T. representative), six students, thirteen paraprofessionals, and thirteen parents. Parents, students, and paraprofessionals were considered to represent the community. Thus, since only 29 percent of the total group can be classified as school professionals, it is clear that the developers were not successful in their effort to recruit equal numbers of school professionals and community representatives. As we mentioned previously, the developers report that the refusal of the Community School Boards to officially cooperate with the program greatly hindered the recruiting process. Since earlier cycles of the program indicated that it was important to have an equal balance of participants so that both groups could react freely without feeling themselves to be on the defensive, this result must be regarded as highly unfortunate. This imbalance was more severe at the Bronx site than in Brooklyn, and may have contributed to the problems that the program experienced in the Bronx.

Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were female, and 23 percent were male. They reported the following levels of educational attainment:

Did not complete High school	-	32%
High school graduates	-	30%
Some college	-	9%
B.A.	-	7%
M.A. or Ph.D.	-	23%

This reflects a considerable change from the previous cycle, in which 58 percent of the respondents reported themselves as possessing either a B.A. or a more advanced degree, while 37 percent indicated that they had not gone beyond high school. However, in both cycles educational attainment has been a sharp dividing line between the school professionals and the community representatives. In the current cycle all participants with a B.A. or a more advanced degree were school professionals, all who indicated that they had either "some college" or had not gone beyond high school were community representatives.

Seven persons (16 percent) stated that they had previously been enrolled in a CUE sponsored program. None of the respondents indicated that they had participated in any related programs sponsored by any other agency.

Sixteen of the respondents (36 percent) had been associated with the district's schools for seven years or more, 13 (or 30 percent) for four to six years, 11 (or 25 percent) for one to three years, and three (or 7 percent) for less than a year. (Two of the latter group dropped out before the end of the program.) All but one of the professionals had worked in the district for at least four years. All of the professionals, and one of the students, resided outside of the district.

Of the remaining participants, 88 percent had lived in the target districts for at least three years. These findings suggest that all participants probably had a high degree of familiarity with the districts' overall educational problems.

Fifty-five percent of the respondents stated that they were active in educational or community groups in the district, and listed a variety of organizations ranging from the PTA to tenants councils to community action groups. Some were involved in as many as six different groups. Eighteen percent of the respondents (most of them professionals) stated that they were active in educational or community groups outside of the district.

Thus, the overall picture that we get of the group is that it is highly weighted in favor of community representatives; that some of its members have had a high degree of previous activity in educational and community groups; that the group as a whole possesses a broad spectrum of educational attainment, but that educationally it is sharply divided between school and community representatives; that it possesses a considerable background of experience with the local schools, and that its members have had little previous experience with similar programs.

Comparison of the Two Sites

Analysis of the findings given above by borough reveals a number of differences between the Bronx group and that in Brooklyn. Six of the seven participants who stated that they had previously been involved in a related program belonged to the Brooklyn Group. Members of this group

also indicated that they had a greater background of previous involvement in educational and community organizations. Furthermore, the Brooklyn group enrolled twice as many educators as did the Bronx group. However, the level of educational attainment of the Bronx community representatives was somewhat higher than that of the Brooklyn community representatives. In addition, the Bronx group had a considerably higher proportion of paraprofessionals. As we have previously mentioned, about 13 percent of the sessions were observed. The observer noted a considerable difference in the characters of the two groups. The Brooklyn groups evidenced far more knowledge of local educational politics and a deeper involvement in them. Such questions as the merits of appointing certain persons as principals and the reasons behind actions of the Community School Board were frequently discussed in Brooklyn, and it was quite evident that a number of participants from both school and community attended meetings of the Board and attempted to influence its decisions. It was also clear that some of the community participants belonged to organized groups working for educational changes in the district.

In contrast, the Bronx group while evidencing knowledge and concern about the problems of the schools, generally revealed little awareness of what the educational issues were at the district level. It was also clear that most of the participants' knowledge of the workings of the educational establishment above the level of the individual school was quite limited, as was their previous experience in discussing educational questions.

Possibly as a result of this comparative lack of knowledge and previous activity, the discussions of the Bronx groups tended to be more poorly focused than in Brooklyn, and were frequently characterized by radical shifts from the extremely general to the extremely personal. However, the personal problems of two of the more vocal participants also contributed to this result. In addition, the Bronx groups manifested a much greater degree of dependency on the group leaders, and often appeared to view them as teachers, despite their continual efforts to emphasize that this was not their role.

Furthermore, the members of the Brooklyn groups appeared more capable of freely discussing their thoughts and feelings with each other. This difference appeared far greater than is suggested by the results of the participant rating forms, in which the Brooklyn group members' rating of their freedom to participate were slightly (but consistently) higher than those of the Bronx group. At the start of the program, none of the community participants in the Bronx appeared to have developed their leadership potential to the point where they could effectively challenge the professionals. In at least one of the Brooklyn groups this was certainly not the case. Open disagreement and the beginning of a dialogue were evident by the second session (the first session we observed.) In the Bronx, community participants often appeared reluctant to openly challenge statements by the professionals with which they privately disagreed, although in some cases they reported their lack of agreement to the developers after the session. On the other hand, some of the professionals appeared

content to restrict their comments primarily to safe generalities. Thus, at some sessions no real dialogue seemed to develop between the school people and the community representatives.

Although this situation certainly improved over the course of the program, discussions of the backgrounds and solutions to educational problems (as opposed to the participants' individual experiences with them) frequently lacked the degree of spontaneity in exchange of ideas and opinions that was typical of the Brooklyn groups and of the third cycle of the program. In addition, the Bronx groups evidenced considerably more difficulty in arriving at concrete solutions to the problems discussed. For these reasons we believe that the Bronx workshop had only limited success in achieving the programs basic goals -- goals which the Brooklyn groups and the previous cycle of the program indicated what the program could achieve.

We attribute this result to the recruitment of a group of community representatives with comparatively little previous involvement in local educational issues, none of whom had previously demonstrated leadership potential in this area; possibly coupled with the failure to recruit a sufficiently large group of school professionals. Both the Evaluation and Development Divisions are in agreement that selection procedures must be further refined to ensure that participants have the background and the personal qualities necessary for them to derive the maximum benefit from the program. The Evaluation staff feel that this could best be ac-

complished by the selection of community participants, most of whom have either a considerable background of involvement in educational and community groups or who have graduated from one of the other components of LASER and demonstrated a high potential for leadership. If the developers also wish to involve participants who have little background in education and community work, we suggest that a screening instrument be devised based on the leadership criteria of the Educational Leadership Development component.

However, the Evaluation staff feel that the programs' chance of success in achieving its ultimate goal, the improvement of education in the district through an exchange of ideas and a rapprochment between school and community, would be greatly enhanced if the participants selected were in a position to influence the groups that they represent. From this point of view, it seems greatly preferable that the majority of the community participants be persons whose previous activity in the community has given them some degree of influence in existing groups; while the majority of school representatives should be principals, U.F.T. chapter chairmen or school board members.

The Curriculum

Our primary source of data for determining how and to what extent the session plans were utilized was the Group Leaders' Session Rating Form, supplemented by the Participants Session Rating Form and the

observations. Unfortunately, the group leaders' rating forms were keyed to the "Activities" and "Outcomes" sections of the session plans. This resulted in information that is extremely vague and difficult to use, since it is not possible to determine, for example, what is meant by "partially" completing a discussion of accountability. All that can be determined from such a response is that some time was spent on the activity. The nature and depth of the discussion, and the degree to which the participants understood the concept remain unknown. In addition, the fact that each group met twice each week resulted in the group leaders being under considerable time pressure. This frequently led to a rather cursory filling out of the forms and to a number of instances in which they were never filled out.

As a result, much of the data that we hoped to gather through the Group Leaders' Rating Form is of limited utility. While our basic question has been answered to some extent, questions relating to specific aspects of the curriculum have not.

Since there were two groups in each borough and the program consisted of 15 sessions, there was a total of 60 individual sessions. Group Leader rating forms were submitted for 67 percent of these sessions. Almost all those which were not submitted related to the later portions of the program. However, since in all of the groups half of the next-to-last sessions was devoted to the posttest and half of the last session to a farewell party, the importance of some of the missing sessions can be discounted to some degree. If these sessions are omitted from the total, forms were completed for 77 percent of the sessions.

As we indicated previously, a basic question that we wished to ask was to what extent the curriculum was actually followed. The following is a breakdown of how the group leaders rated their adherance to the session plan of each session for which we have data:

Not closely at all	27%
Fairly closely	43%
Closely	14%
Very closely	11%
No Response	5%

The fact that session plans were followed "not closely at all" at 27 percent of the sessions for which we have data, appears to confirm our expectation (based on observation of the previous cycle) that the plans would be frequently modified or abandoned. Observational data indicates that these deviations were usually caused by either the participants desire to continue a discussion beyond the time alloted for it, or their feeling that another topic was of greater importance and interest to them. On the very few occasions over the last two cycles when the group leader attempted to adhere to a session plan despite participant resistance or lack of interest, the session appeared to be unproductive. There was little interaction in the group, participants appeared bored or restless, and discussions appeared to be either inconclusive or repetitive. Since there appear to be considerable variations in the responses evoked from the participants by identical

sessions, we must conclude that flexibility in the implementation of the curriculum is a highly positive factor in achieving the type of interaction desired.

However, such flexibility clearly shifts a major portion of the responsibility for the content and outcome of the program from the written materials to the group leader, thus creating a serious problem of replicability. At the present time the curriculum does not appear to furnish the group leader with sufficient guidelines for him to determine when deviations from the session plans are advisable and how they can best be structured. Some aspects of this question are addressed in the Manual of Procedures[1], and a new introduction to the Workshop Leaders Guide also addresses these problems to some degree. However, we believe that it would be extremely valuable to future group leaders if the Development Division produced a considerably expanded introduction to the Workshop Leaders' Guide which would outline the step-by-step interactional objectives the programs suggest, what techniques are best used in what interactional situations, provide criteria for judging when a change of plan is warranted and when an irrelevant issue is being introduced; detail what pitfalls to avoid and how to avoid them, and generally provide a guide for group leaders attempting to structure and

---

[1] Vincent C. Flemmings and Farrell L. McClane, Planning for Effective Community-School Relations: A Manual of Procedures. Center for Urban Education, Fall 1972.

direct sessions that depart from the written materials. In other words, we feel that the production of a short guide that would be as unrelated as possible to the content of the sessions would be invaluable in assisting the group leader to replicate the programs basic approach to problems of community school relations, even though the actual problems discussed may differ.

Unfortunately, our data do not permit us to advance much beyond the conclusions that we reached at the end of the previous cycle in evaluating the specific techniques utilized in the Workshop Leaders' Guide. A stress on problem-solving techniques still appears to be the most fundamental and valuable aspect of the curriculum in relation to the programs' long range goal of improving education in the district. However, in both of the last two cycles of the program the participants appeared to experience some difficulty in moving from the discussion of possible solutions to problems to a discussion of the various mechanisms by which they could attempt to implement these solutions in the real world.

Since it is hoped that the participants' involvement with each other and with educational problems will continue after they complete the program, we believe that it would be valuable to create one or two alternative sessions focusing on what tactics might be most productive in obtaining a hearing for their ideas. If the group

possesses a sufficient degree of sophistication about the educational problems of their district, it may be possible to compress the time alloted to the more informational sessions in order to deal with such tactics at the end of the program. However, consideration of this problem would only be appropriate if the group has reached a considerable degree of agreement on the nature of the problems with which they are dealing and the best solutions to them. If they have reached this stage, then consideration of tactical problems would serve as a basic point of departure from which they could work together to improve education in their district after their graduation from the program.

In conclusion, the Workshop Leaders' Guide appears to function as a basic framework for the program with participant input serving to effect different modifications in each sub-group of each cycle. The way in which changes are handled and blended into the existing curriculum is the responsibility of the group leader. It is our belief that additional material directed toward assisting him to structure such modifications would be extremely helpful. For workshop groups which are sufficiently advanced to utilize them, it may also be valuable to create additional materials focusing on possible tactics for the implementation of group proposals.

Rating of Personal Impact

In order to determine what aspects of the program the participants felt had the greatest personal impact, the posttest presented them with a list of 16 statements, most of which had been drawn from the "expected outcomes" sections of the session plans. The statements were phrased in terms of individual skill, knowledge, or understanding -- e.g., "my understanding of the problems of the schools in my district." The participants were requested to rate their improvement on a scale from one (a lot) to four (not at all). Ratings tended to be very high for all statements and ranged from 76 percent who said that the program had improved their understanding of parents "a lot," to a low of 33 percent who felt that their knowledge of ways to improve cooperation between school and community had improved "a lot." "My ease and confidence in talking to other people who have different points of view" received the second highest rating. Sixty-seven percent of the participants felt that they had improved "a lot" in this area.

In only one case ("my understanding of the role of the community board") did as many as 9 percent of the participants feel that the program had not helped them at all, and only in this question and in

---

[1] For a complete breakdown of the ratings see Appendix IV; for the actual instrument see Appendix III, P. 14.

"my understanding of the problems facing principals," did as many as 27 percent of the participants feel that the program had helped them "a little" or "not at all." These results are hardly surprising, since comparatively few principals or assistant principals, and no Community School Board members, participated in the program, with the result that the views of these groups tended to be poorly represented in the workshops.

It is interesting to note that paraprofessionals gave distinctly higher ratings to almost every area of the program than did school professionals or other community people. This result is congruent with those of the semantic differential in which most significant changes can be traced to the paraprofessionals.

In response to our request for suggestions as to how the program might be improved, 52 percent of the participants either failed to respond, indicated that they had no suggestions, or made suggestions which were irrevelent, impractical, or illegible. Fifteen percent felt that the program should concentrate more heavily on specific solutions to problems, 12 percent felt that it should recruit additional or different participants, 18 percent made a variety of specific suggestions as to changes in technique (more role-playing, more guest speakers, etc.), and one person felt that the program should be longer.

The suggestion that the program should concentrate more on specific solutions to problems may be related to the fact that the participants gave relatively low ratings to the programs' improvement of their knowledge of ways to improve cooperation between school and community. "My skill in finding out the causes of educational problems" also received relatively low ratings. Although the participants may just be asking for easy answers to difficult questions, these responses suggest that the program might increase its' effectiveness by limiting its focus to a thorough analysis of a small number of carefully delimited problems.

For example, it is possible that sessions seven through ten, all of which have as a major component the consideration of the thorny questions of racism in the schools and minority aspirations, might benefit from a more specific focus on one or two concrete, solvable problems which would exemplify the broader questions in this area.

However, the ratings of personal impact coupled with the fact that all the respondents, with one exception, stated that they would be willing to recommend that others participate in the program even if the stipend were to be discontinued, indicate a high degree of personal satisfaction with their experience in the program. This finding is further confirmed by the usually high ratings on the participant rating forms.

Open-Ended Questions

Open-ended questions were included in the pretest and the posttest to record any unexpected developments that might be missed by other parts of the instrument and to allow the participants to express themselves more freely than would otherwise have been possible. Not unexpectedly, the responses tend to be a diverse mixture of the extremely general and the extremely specific, and are of limited utility in suggesting ways to modify the program. This is particularly true of the questions relating to the areas of greatest and least success of the program.

The participants' ideas of the best way to improve community-school relations reveal little evidence of change over the course of the program. Both before and after the program, most respondents believed that improved communication or greater interaction between school and community would be the best ways to improve relations. However, both the school and community participants views of their districts' most important educational problems and the most realistic solutions to these problems exhibit an interesting change.

Initially, the participants tended to mention either specific in-school programs or problems (reading, lack of materials, discipline), communication, or a need for better school personnel as being the principal educational problems of their district. On the posttest, the number of participants choosing the need for better personnel increased

markedly, while the number choosing the other categories above declined. This shift is even more evident in the suggested solutions to the problems. The number of respondents indicating that improved selection or training of school personnel was one of the best solutions to the districts' educational problems rose from one-fifth on the pretest to almost half of the total group on the posttest. On the pretest, school professionals volunteered this response more frequently than did community representatives. On the posttest, it was given by approximately equal percentages of the two groups.

Although it would not be wise to make too much of this result, it is interesting to note that it tends to correspond with the results of the semantic differential in that it suggests that school personnel initially possessed a somewhat more negative view of their own group than did the community representatives and that the programatic experience resulted in the two groups arriving at similar viewpoints.

Semantic Differential[1]

A semantic differential technique was used to detect change in the participants views on certain concepts fundamental to the curriculum, such as "Accountability" and "Community-School Relations." Concepts such as "School Professionals" and "Paraprofessionals" were also included

[1]See Appendix III, Pages 2-12.

in an attempt to determine whether or not the participants' perceptions of these concepts would change. A total of ten concepts and ten seven-point scales were used. The scales were designed to explore the evaluative, dynamic, and receptive aspects of the participants' semantic space. In the discussion that follows (when evaluative scales are used), 1.0 is the extreme positive response, 4.0 is the neutral response or unrelated to the concept, and 7.0 is the extreme negative response.

When the total group of respondents is considered, only two concepts and two scales indicate changes that are statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence. On neither the pretest nor the posttest was the mean rating of any concept associated with the negative end of any evaluative scale. The ratings ranged from very positive to neutral.

The two concepts that show change are the concept "Paraprofessionals" on the scales "friendly-unfriendly," and the concept "School Professionals" on the scales "fair-unfair" and "friendly-unfriendly." The rating of "School Professionals" on the latter scale moved from a mean of 2.9 (slightly friendly) to one of 4.1 (neutral, or unrelated to the concept.) Analysis of this rating for professional and community participants, separately, reveals a statistically significant movement from 2.5 to 4.0 in the rating of the concept by the community group. The rating of the concept by the professionals shifted from 3.8 to 4.2, a change

which is not significant. In other words, at the beginning of the program the community representatives associated the concept "School Professionals" with friendliness more strongly than did the professionals themselves, but by the end of the program the ratings of both groups corresponded closely.

Further analysis shows that a large portion of this shift can be traced to the paraprofessionals, whose mean rating of the concept moved from 2.5 to 4.6. Ratings by the other community participants moved from 2.5 to 3.6. It is also noteworthy that the shift was greater in the Bronx (-2.2) than in Brooklyn (-.6). The changes in the Bronx and among the paraprofessionals are significant at the .01 level.

The overall pattern of change in relation to the concept "School Professionals" on the scale "fair-unfair" is similar to that described above. Ratings by the total group show a significant change from 3.2 to 4.3. The mean rating by the community participants went from 3.0 to 4.4 and is significant, the professionals rating moved from 3.7 to 4.0 and is not significant. Further breakdowns show change significance at the .01 level among the paraprofessionals and Bronx participants (a disproportionate number of whom were paraprofessionals) shifted from a rather positive view of the friendliness and fairness of school professionals to a position of neutrality on these questions. This may simply be the result of an initial reluctance by the paraprofessionals to reveal

their true feelings about their institutional superiors, or it may reflect a real change in their viewpoint brought about by their association as equals with a particular group of professionals. If it is believed that the professionals are unlikely to underrate their own group the change in the perceptions of the community representatives may be a positive development, a move toward a more realistic conception of the professionals.

The pattern outlined above does not appear in the rating of the concept "Paraprofessionals" on the "friendly-unfriendly" scale. The rating exhibited a significant shift, at the .01 level, from 1.9 to 2.6. This result was analyzed by borough, and by its community and professional components. However, the only sub-group to reveal a statistically significant shift was the Brooklyn group, whose ratings moved from 2.0 to 2.8.

While the reason for the change in the Brooklyn participants' ratings is not clear to us, the shift in the direction of neutrality is similar to that which occured in the ratings of the concept "School Professionals." Although we have no evidence to substantiate it, it is tempting to hypothesize that the program resulted in an increased perception of the various participant groups as being composed of individuals with individual strengths and weaknesses, thus leading toward more neutral ratings of them.

All concepts and all scales were broken down into their Brooklyn and Bronx, and professional and community components. This breakdown revealed one other change that was statistically significant. The ratings of "Parent Involvement" by professionals on the "open-closed" scale moved from 4.2 to 2.6. Since open-closed is basically not an evaluative scale, this shift does not mean that the professionals viewed the concept more positively at the end of the program than at the beginning. It simply means that they associated "Parent Involvement" more strongly with "openness" at the end of the program. It appears probable that this is the direct result of discussions of the desirability of "opening up the school" to greater involvement by parents. The perception of the concept as being related to the idea of openness seems a natural result. What is more interesting is that the community participants shift from 4.0 to 3.6 is not statistically significant. Apparently they were not convinced that "Parent Involvement" and openness were related. This result may imply that the participants did not view parent involvement as being effective in opening up the schools, but no other evidence exists to confirm this hypothesis.

No significant changes are evident on any of the scales in the participants' ratings of the concepts "Group Decision Making," "Parents in this District," "Educational Change," "Community-School Relations,"

"Accountability," or "Children in this District."

In sum, the semantic differential sections of the pretest and the posttest reveal little evidence of change in the participants' attitudes toward the concepts measured. With one exception (the rating of "Parent Involvement" noted above), all changes are in the direction of neutrality and relate to the participants perceptions of groups present in the sessions. The results suggest that the program had the greatest impact on paraprofessionals, but this may simply reflect an initial reluctance by the paraprofessionals to set down their feelings about their superiors in the educational hierarchy.

Participation in Decision-Making

Since the Workshop Leaders' Guide included materials for several sessions dealing with accountability and the allocation of responsibility for making decisions that affect the operation of the schools, we hypothesized that the program would affect the participants' views on how much input various groups should have in making decisions about educational policy. As a measure of such change, we asked the participants what level of responsibility each of five groups should have in five areas of decision-making. Unfortunately, some participants evidenced considerable difficulty in understanding the question. On the pretest, a number of them either failed to answer parts of the question or gave unusable responses. This limits the utility of a comparison of pretest and posttest responses, although we shall indicate some general changes, and some patterns of response exhibited on both

the pretest and the posttest.

The participants were presented with five areas of education in which decisions must be made: changing the school curriculum, determining how the district's money will be spent, determining childrens educational needs, removing teachers, and evaluating educational programs. They were then asked which group should have major responsibility in each area, which two groups should have some involvement, and which two should have little involvement. They were to choose either parents, teachers, students, principals, or the Community School Board.[1]

On the pretest, the largest group of respondents indicated that they felt that the Community School Board should have major responsibility in the areas of determining how the districts' money should be spent, changing the curriculum, and removing teachers, and that teachers should have the major responsibility in the areas of evaluating programs and determining childrens educational needs. Students were placed in the "little involvement" category more frequently than any other group in every area except that of removing teachers. In the latter case, equal percentages of the respondents placed students and teachers in the "little involvement" category. Parents were placed in the "some involvement" category more frequently than any other group in all five areas of decision-making.

---

[1]See Appendix III, Page 16.

Three shifts were evident on the posttest. More respondents chose principals to have the major responsibility for removing teachers than chose the Community School Board to have the major responsibility for evaluating programs than chose the teachers. The third shift is more tenuous and is probably not significant. Principals were mentioned more frequently than parents in the "some involvement" category in the area of determining how the districts' money should be spent. However, if one also considers the respondents who said that parents or principals should have the major responsibility in this area, it is clear that the group in general rated parents second only to the Community School Board.

The responses to this question appear to be basically fairly conservative and the shifts do not appear to indicate any radical changes in the participants' perceptions of how responsibility should be shared in the enumerated areas.

In a related question we focused upon community involvement at the local school level. The question was of the multiple response type, and directed the participants to choose the two best ways for a principal to increase community support for his school. The responses were selected to allow the participants to opt for varying degrees of community involvement.

On both the pre- and posttest approximately two-thirds of the respondents chose "Having teacher-parent workshops to discuss school problems," and approximately one-third chose "Encouraging parents to visit classrooms," as one of the two responses. The latter alternative appears to be of a relatively passive, information-gathering nature, while the former implies an active exchange of information, without implying any influence on decisions.

The greatest changes occurred in the categories "Explain school policies through the P.A. or P.T.A." which increased from 12 to 24 percent between pretest and posttest, and in "Have community residents advise on curriculum," which increased from nine to 21 percent. These movements appear to be in opposite directions. Greater utilization of the P.T.A. is a relatively traditional solution phrased in a rather passive manner, while having community residents advise on curriculum is activist and fairly radical in the context of the local schools. Only one other category, "Hold parent orientation meeting at the start of the school year," was chosen by more than 20 percent of those tested on either the pretest or posttest. Twenty-one percent chose it on the pretest and 15 percent on the posttest. This is an extremely passive solution. The remainder of the choices are broadly distributed. Thus, the responses to this question implies that the participants believe that community primarily desires an increased access to information about the school and an opportunity to exchange ideas with its staff.

Only a comparatively small number believe that greater community influence on educational decisions would be the best way to increase support for the school. The changes between pretest and posttest are relatively small, although they may point to a slightly more active approach to community-school problems.

In summary, both before and after their experience in the program the participants appear to have desired a greater degree of parental involvement in all five areas of decision-making, while generally supporting the status quo as to who should have the ultimate responsibility for decisions and who should have little involvement in them. The level of involvement desired appears to be that of having assured avenues of communication through which parents can know what is happening in the school and be certain that their views will be carefully considered by the decision makers. There was little change between pretest and posttest, although there are indications that the programatic experience may have resulted in increasing the desire of some participants for a more active community role in educational decision-making.

Preceptions of Political Reality

Our previous experience with the program also led us to hypothesize the possibility of its effecting changes in the participants perceptions of the political relationship between community, principal, and Community School Board.

To test this possibility we devised a simple problem situation in which the Board, the principals, and the community representatives each propose that a different and new program be introduced into the schools[1]. The participants were then asked to choose what would be the most likely and the least likely reactions of each group to this situation. The alternatives that we listed were essentially identical for each group, although the wording was adjusted to reflect the different political positions of the three groups.

On the pretest, the largest percentage (21 percent) of respondents indicated that they though the CSB would examine all three programs carefully before making a decision. On the posttest this increased to 33 percent. This increase was primarily due to a doubling of the number of Bronx respondents giving this response. This choice suggests that the participants considered that the Board was capable of considering new proposals fairly, but unwilling to engage in a dialogue on the issue.

Eighteen percent of the respondents on the pretest indicated that they though that the CSB would try to meet with the other groups to work out compromises. All but one of these respondents belonged to the Bronx group. No one chose this alternative on the posttest. This choice suggests considerable flexibility on the part of the Board.

---

[1] See Appendix III, Page 15.

Fifteen percent of the respondents (all of them from the Brooklyn group) thought that the CSB would be most likely to simply use its own program. On the posttest this increased to 21 percent but once again all the respondents were from Brooklyn. This choice indicates a lack of flexibility and a resistance to suggestions by other groups. It is interesting to note that on both the pretest and posttest the majority of the respondents choosing this alternative were professionals. No one believed that the Board would choose the community residents' program.

Responses as to what the CSB would be least likely to do were broadly distributed. Trying out all three programs, using their own program, and meeting with the other groups to work out a compromise, were each chosen by 15 percent of the respondents as the least likely alternatives. The number choosing compromise as the least likely increased to 24 percent on the posttest, while the numbers choosing the other two alternatives exhibited slight declines. On both the pre- and posttests a majority of those who believed that an attempt at compromise was least likely belonged to the Brooklyn group.

Thus, it appears that there are marked differences in the ways that the Bronx and Brooklyn participants perceived their Community School Boards. It seems clear that the Brooklyn group viewed the Board as being relatively inflexible and unwilling to compromise, although many thought it capable of independently giving careful consideration to new

ideas. There are indications that the professionals felt the Board to be more inflexible than did the participants from the community. While there was little change over the course of the program, it seems to have been in the direction of an intensification of this feeling. The Bronx participants initially seemed to feel that the Board would either carefully consider all suggestions or attempt a compromise, but by the end of the program they appeared to view the board as being resistant to compromise, although not inflexible.

This difference between the Bronx and Brooklyn groups is not evident in their responses to the parts of the question concerning principals and community residents.

The second part of the problem related to the probable reactions of principals. On the pretest, 18 percent indicated that principals would be most likely to agree with the Board's program. Since the respondents were not told what the programs were and were given no reason to believe that any one program was better than the others, this choice indicated a belief that the principals would simply follow the lead of those in authority. Fifteen percent of the respondents chose the alternatives of trying out all three programs; a solution which suggests indecisiveness, although it may also indicate flexibility and willingness to experiment. Fifteen percent also chose "examining all three programs and deciding which one to work for." Twelve percent thought that the principals would agree to use the Boards' program and

have their own used experimentally, and twelve percent believed that the principals would continue to work for their own program. No significant change occurred on the posttest.

On the pretest, twenty-four percent of the respondents indicated that they believed that it was least likely that principals would meet with other groups to work out a compromise, and 15 percent indicated that it was least likely that they would advocate the community residents program. The remaining responses were broadly distributed. However, no one thought that it was least likely that the principals would agree to use the Boards program while their own was tried out in a few schools.

On the posttest, the percentage believing that principals were least likely to compromise dropped from 24 percent to 12 percent. This change occurred entirely among community people and paraprofessionals in the Brooklyn group. In another change from the pretest, the percentage believing that principals were least likely to agree to use the Boards' program while their own was tried out in a few schools went from zero to 12 percent. Once again the remaining responses were broadly distributed.

Thus, there was little agreement as to what the principals would be most likely to do, a situation that did not change on the posttest. However, among Brooklyn community representatives there is evidence of an increased belief in the principals willingness to compromise. The increase in the number of respondents who thought principals least likely

to back use of the Boards' program coupled with an experimental trial of their own program is puzzling.

The third section of the question concerned the probable reactions of community residents. Thirty-three percent of the group tested (a majority of them community representatives) felt that the community residents' group would examine all three alternatives. Twenty-seven percent (a majority of whom were professionals) thought the community would continue to work for their own program, and 15 percent believed that they would back the CSB's program and advocate experimental use of their own.

On the posttest, there was a large increase in the "no response" category in this part of the question. However, the percentage believing that community representatives would simply accept the school board's program rose from zero to nine percent. No other significant change was evident on the pretest.

On the pretest, thirty percent of the group chose "trying out all three programs in a few schools" as the least likely alternative for the community residents', but only 15 percent indicated that it was least likely that the community residents would adopt the CSB program. No one chose the alternative of community residents backing their own program as least likely on the pretest, but 15 percent did so on the posttest.

It appears that community participants tended to think that their representatives would carefully consider the alternatives, while the professionals tended to believe that the community representatives would adhere rigidly to their own ideas. The changes between the pretest and posttest may point to the growth of a belief among some participants that the community residents would be over - awed by the other groups and support their programs.

In summary, the changes in the participants perceptions of the probable reactions of principals, Board members, and community residents are slight. The most pronounced change is an increasingly negative view of the CSB's willingness to compromise.

Conclusion of the Program

At the conclusion of the program the Brooklyn participants were invited to join an educational action group that had originally been formed by graduates of the previous cycle, and which is involved in working for educational change in the district. Many of the participants expressed interest in joining the group and it has been reported that a number of them have participated actively in its meetings. Such continuing post-program involvement in local educational activities by group members of diverse backgrounds suggests that the program has achieved a degree of success in bringing about a meeting of minds between representatives of both school and community.

Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

The participants found the program to be both interesting and worthwhile. They perceived it as having considerable personal impact on various areas of their knowledge and on their ability to relate to others. Observation confirms that relations between group members did change over the course of the program. However, the participants perceptions of concepts fundamental to the program and of various groups involved with education reveal little evidence of change. Those changes that have been noted suggest that the program had the greatest impact on paraprofessionals, although this may be the result of greater frankness on their part at the end of the program than at the beginning. Marked differences were noted in the level of interaction of the Brooklyn and Bronx groups. These differences suggest that the program had only limited success in achieving its basic objectives in the Bronx. This result appears to be traceable to the fact that the Bronx participants generally had comparatively little previous involvement in local educational issues, although the programs failure to meet its target in the recruitment of school professionals may also have had a negative effect on its success. The Development Division is planning to implement more stringent selection criteria in future cycles.

The Workshop Leaders' Guide appears to function as a basic framework for the program with participant input serving to effect different modifications in each sub-group of each cycle. The way in which changes are handled and blended into the existing curriculum is the responsibility of the group leader. It is our belief that additional material directed toward assisting him to structure such modifications would be extremely helpful. For workshop groups which are sufficiently advanced to utilize them, it may also be valuable to create additional materials focusing on possible tactics for the implementation of group proposals.

The fact that few changes are evident in the participants overall perceptions of various groups and concepts important to education in the district suggests that it may be important for the participants to continue to maintain contact with each other after graduation from the program in order to have any real influence on the improvement of community-school relations.

In Brooklyn, a number of participants of diverse backgrounds evidenced a continuing interest in working together on educational problems and joined a voluntary group formed by graduates of the previous cycle in order to accomplish this purpose. This step seems very promising.

In conclusion, although changes in the relationships between the individual participants generally did not appear to have much effect on their views of the groups that these participants represented, these changes indicate that in Brooklyn (although not in the Bronx) the programs basic interactional objectives were met, while the fact that some of the participants are continuing to work together suggests the possibility of a long-range effect on the community-school relations in the district.

Appendix I

COMMUNITY-SCHOOL RELATIONS WORKSHOPS, 1971-72

Participants' Session Rating Form

Date: _____

These questions on the session along with your suggestions will assist in improving the quality of the Workshops. Please answer each question below; you may answer in Spanish if you wish to do so. Use the back of this form if you need more space for additional comments. Be sure to hand in this form before you leave.

1. If you are an occasional or first-time visitor, check here: _____

2. I am in (please check):
_____Group #1
_____Group #2

3. I am a:
_____Community School Board member
_____Parent participant
_____Other Community; please describe: _____
_____UFT Chapter Chairman
_____Teacher
_____Paraprofessional
_____Principal
_____Assistant Principal
_____Student
_____Other; please describe: _____

4. What was the major topic of today's session: _____

5. In relation to the Workshop's overall goals, today's topic was:
_____Unimportant
_____Of some importance
_____Important
_____Of great importance

6. In relation to today's major topic, the discussion was:
_____Almost never relevant
_____Sometimes relevant
_____Frequently relevant
_____Almost always relevant

7. During today's session, I felt free to participate:
_____None of the time
_____Some of the time
_____All of the time.

8. If any printed materials were used for today's session, please answer the following:

The printed materials were:
_____Not relevant to the topic
_____Somewhat relevant to the topic

9. What was the major technique used today (e.g., discussion, lecture, role-play, etc.): _____

10. I found the technique to be:
_____Not appropriate to the topic
_____Somewhat appropriate to the topic
_____Appropriate to the topic
_____Very appropriate to the topic

11. I found this technique to be:
_____Used very poorly
_____Used somewhat poorly
_____Used fairly well
_____Used very well

12. In general, I felt that the:
_____Teachers didn't participate enough
_____Principals didn't participate enough
_____Community representatives didn't participate enough
_____Everyone participated well

13. In relation to the educational needs of this community, today's session was:
_____Not very relevant
_____Somewhat relevant
_____Relevant
_____Highly relevant

14. Overall, I found the quality of today's session to be:
_____Very poor
_____Poor
_____Fair
_____Good
_____Excellent

15. What was the one best thing about today's session? _____

16. What was the least satisfactory thing about today's session? _____

17. Future Workshops can be improved by: _____

_____Community School Board Member
_____Parent participant
_____Other Community; please describe:

_____

_____UFT Chapter Chairman
_____Teacher
_____Paraprofessional
_____Principal
_____Assistant Principal
_____Student
_____Other; please describe: _____

_____

4. What was the major topic of today's session: _____

_____

5. In relation to the Workshop's overall goals, today's topic was:
_____Unimportant
_____Of some importance
_____Important
_____Of great importance

6. In relation to today's major topic, the discussion was:
_____Almost never relevant
_____Sometimes relevant
_____Frequently relevant
_____Almost always relevant

7. During today's session, I felt free to participate:
_____None of the time
_____Some of the time
_____All of the time.

8. If any printed materials were used for today's session, please answer the following:

The printed materials were:
_____Not relevant to the topic
_____Somewhat relevant to the topic
_____Relevant to the topic
_____Very relevant to the topic

The printed materials were:
_____Confusing
_____Somewhat unclear
_____Very clear

_____Appropriate to the topic
_____Very appropriate to the topic

11. I found this technique to be:
_____Used very poorly
_____Used somewhat poorly
_____Used fairly well
_____Used very well

12. In general, I felt that the:
_____Teachers didn't participate enough
_____Principals didn't participate enough
_____Community representatives didn't participate enough
_____Everyone participated well

13. In relation to the educational needs of this community, today's session was:
_____Not very relevant
_____Somewhat relevant
_____Relevant
_____Highly relevant

14. Overall, I found the quality of today's session to be:
_____Very poor
_____Poor
_____Fair
_____Good
_____Excellent

15. What was the one best thing about today's session? _____

_____

_____

16. What was the least satisfactory thing about today's session? _____

_____

_____

17. Future Workshops can be improved by:

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX II 041172

Evaluation and Research Division
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

COMMUNITY-SCHOOL RELATIONS WORKSHOP
Discussion Leader Session Rating Form

We want this report to furnish us with a record of what happens at each session so that we may evaluate the current program and plan for future ones.

We are asking you to complete this form for each session as soon as possible after the session ends while the meeting is still fresh in your mind. Some of the following questions refer to activities, outcomes, and topics listed in the session outlines. If you wish, you may answer some of the questions by using the number or letter given to these activities in the outline. Because only one form was developed for all sessions, it was impossible to anticipate all that might happen; we therefore urge you to describe problems or situations not covered in this form that you think we should know about.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Name: _____ ____ Brooklyn ____ Bronx

Date: _____ Session number: _____ Group: I ____ II ____

1. How many regular participants attended today's session? _____

2. Did any new people attend?

____ No
____ Yes; if yes, please describe, and indicate if they were visitors:

_____

_____

3. If a sizable number of a group of participants did not attend today's session, what was the reason? (conflicting meeting, weather, etc.)

_____

4. Were there any physical problems - space, materials, etc. - that interfered with the conduct of the session?

____ No
____ Yes; if yes, please describe: _____

_____

_____

5. In general, how closely did you follow the outline for today's session?

____ Not closely at all
____ Somewhat closely
____ Closely
____ Very closely

6. In the first column, indicate the activities listed in the session outline that were covered in today's session. Put a check in the second column if the activity was completed. In the third column, approximate the time actually spent on the activity. In the last column, indicate for each activity which took more or less time than you had anticipated.

Activity Number	Completed (check if YES)	Time Spent	More or Less Time Than Anticipated

7. If any scheduled activities, listed in the session outline, were omitted please explain why:

_____

_____

_____

8. Were any activities, objectives, topics or techniques added to today's session?

____ No
____ Yes; If yes, please describe what was added: _____

_____

_____

9. Were there any important interruptions that interfered with the conduct of the session?

___ No
___ Yes; if yes, please describe: _____

_____

10. Overall, did you have enough time to adequately conduct today's session?

___ No
___ Yes

11. What were the major topics discussed today? (E.g., if the activity was choosing a problem, what were the principle problems discussed?)

_____

_____

_____

12. Which activity or topic covered in today's session appeared to be most productive in stimulating interest and interaction? _____

_____

_____

13. Which activity or topic appeared to be most productive in creating mutual understanding? _____

_____

_____

14. Which activity or topic covered today appeared to stimulate the least interest? _____

_____

Why do you think that this was the case? _____

_____

_____

15. Overall, in your opinion, today's discussion was:

___ Almost never relevant to the session's stated objectives
___ Sometimes relevant to the session's stated objectives
___ Frequently relevant to the session's stated objectives
___ Almost always relevant to the session's stated objectives

16. Which topic or activity elicited the most difference of opinion?

_____

_____

_____

17. Did anything happen today that you did not anticipate or for which you did not feel prepared?

____ No
____ Yes; if yes, please describe: _____

_____

_____

18. Were there any problems in making transitions from one activity or topic to the next activity or topic?

____ No
____ Yes; if yes, please describe the problem: _____

_____

_____

_____

19. Was there any difficulty with the size of the group present today?

____ No
____ Yes; if yes, was the group too large, too small, unbalanced (how?):

_____

How did you cope with this difficulty? _____

_____

20. Please indicate below your impression of the participants' overall involvement in today's session.

____ Bored, uninvolved
____ Passive, but mildly involved
____ Fairly actively involved
____ Very actively involved
____ Emotional, volatile (please indicate reasons): _____

_____

_____

21. In general, I felt that (check as many as apply):

____ Teachers didn't participate enough
____ Community representatives didn't participate enough
____ Principals didn't participate enough
____ Students didn't participate enough
____ Everyone participated well

22. Generally, the individuals who participated the most were the:

____ Administrators
____ UFT Chapter Chairmen
____ Bilingual teachers
____ Other teachers
____ Guidance personnel
____ CSB members
____ Paraprofessionals
____ P.A. or P.T.A. officers
____ Other parents
____ Students
____ Others (specify): _____

23. Generally, the individuals who participated least were the:

____ Administrators
____ UFT Chapter Chairmen
____ Bilingual teachers
____ Other teachers
____ Guidance personnel
____ CSB members
____ Paraprofessionals
____ P.A. or P.T.A. officers
____ Other parents
____ Students
____ Others (specify): _____

24. In your opinion, what was the most important thing that occurred today?

_____

_____

_____

_____

25. Indicate the degree to which the outcomes listed in the session outline were achieved today:

Degree	Outcome number
Achieved	_____
Partially achieved	_____
Not sure	_____
Not achieved	_____

Other comments: _____

_____

26. Were there any other outcomes?

____ No
____ Yes; if yes, what were they? _____

_____

_____

27. Did the participants agree on tentative solutions to the problems discussed today?

____ No
____ Yes; if yes, what were the problems and what were the solutions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

28. Did the participants agree on any ways of implementing these solutions:

____ No
____ Yes; if yes, what were they? _____

_____

_____

29. Please rate the overall quality of today's session:

____ Very poor
____ Poor
____ Fair
____ Good
____ Excellent

30. In what ways could this section be improved in the future? Try to be specific in describing what could be added, eliminated, modified, or refocused.

APPENDIX III

Evaluation and Research Division
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

COMMUNITY-SCHOOL RELATIONS WORKSHOP
End of Program Questionnaire, 1971-72

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
05107?

1 2 3 4
5 6 7 8
9 10 11 12

Date: _____

We are asking you to answer the following questions so that we may evaluate this program and improve it. Your responses are confidential and will be seen only by members of the evaluation staff.

For each item, check your response, or complete the answer in the space provided. If you wish to answer in Spanish, you may. If you need more space, please use the backs of the pages.

Name: _____

Which group are you in? _____Group I

_____Group II

1. Check any of the following that describe your relationship to the schools in this school district. You may check more than one.

_____Community School Board member
_____Parent of a child in public school in this district
_____P.A. or P.T.A. representative
_____High school student
_____Paraprofessional
_____Guidance counselor
_____Teacher
_____Bilingual teacher
_____UFT representative
_____Principal
_____Assistant Principal
_____Representative of a community organization; which one?

_____Other; please describe: _____

_____

2. On the following pages we are asking you to judge the meaning of some ideas by rating them on 10 different scales. There are no right or wrong answers. We want to know how the ideas *feel* to you. In making the ratings rely on your first impression.

The IDEA is in CAPITAL LETTERS on the top of the page; underneath are the 10 scales. Here is a sample idea:

HAM

And a sample scale:

Fast ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ Slow

If you feel that the idea is *very* closely related to one end of the scale or the other, put an X here:

Fast _X_:____:____:____:____:____:____ Slow

or here

Fast ____:____:____:____:____:____:_X_ Slow

If you feel that the idea is *fairly* closely related to one end of the scale or the other, put your X here:

Fast ____:_X_:____:____:____:____:____ Slow

or here

Fast ____:____:____:____:____:_X_:____ Slow

If you feel that the idea is only *slightly* related to one end of the scale or the other, put your X here:

Fast ____:____:_X_:____:____:____:____ Slow

or here

Fast ____:____:____:____:_X_:____:____ Slow

If you feel that both ends of the scale are *equally* related to the idea, or if the scale is *completely unrelated* to it, put an X here:

Fast ____:____:____:_X_:____:____:____ Slow

Remember:

Put your X on the line and not between the lines.

Put an X on every scale for every idea, but no more than one X on each scale.

Work quickly. Put down your first impression and do not worry over items.

COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER

Open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Closed

Colorless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Colorful

Wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Foolish

Ineffective _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Effective

Hard _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Soft

Cold _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Hot

Strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Weak

Unfriendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Friendly

Interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Boring

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

GROUP DECISION-MAKING

Open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Closed

Colorless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Colorful

Wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Foolish

Ineffective _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Effective

Hard _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Soft

Cold _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Hot

Strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:___ Weak

Unfriendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Friendly

Interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Boring

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

PARENTS IN THIS DISTRICT

Open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Closed

Colorless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Colorful

Wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Foolish

Ineffective _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Effective

Hard _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Soft

Cold _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Hot

Strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Weak

Unfriendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Friendly

Interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Boring

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Closed

Colorless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Colorful

Wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Foolish

Ineffective _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Effective

Hard _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Soft

Cold _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Hot

Strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Weak

Unfriendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Friendly

Interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Boring

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS

Open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Closed

Colorless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Colorful

Wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Foolish

Ineffective _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Effective

Hard _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Soft

Cold _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Hot

Strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Weak

Unfriendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Friendly

Interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Boring

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

COMMUNITY-SCHOOL RELATIONS

Open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Closed

Colorless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Colorful

Wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Foolish

Ineffective _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Effective

Hard _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Soft

Cold _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Hot

Strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Weak

Unfriendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Friendly

Interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Boring

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Closed

Colorless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Colorful

Wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Foolish

Ineffective _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Effective

Hard _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Soft

Cold _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Hot

Strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Weak

Unfriendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Friendly

Interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Boring

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

PARAPROFESSIONALS

Open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Closed

Colorless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Colorful

Wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Foolish

Ineffective _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Effective

Hard _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Soft

Cold _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Hot

Strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Weak

Unfriendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Friendly

Interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Boring

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

ACCOUNTABILITY

Open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Closed

Colorless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Colorful

Wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Foolish

Ineffective _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Effective

Hard _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Soft

Cold _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Hot

Strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Weak

Unfriendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Friendly

Interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Boring

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

CHILDREN IN THIS DISTRICT

Open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Closed

Colorless _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Colorful

Wise _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Foolish

Ineffective _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Effective

Hard _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Soft

Cold _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Hot

Strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Weak

Unfriendly _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Friendly

Interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Boring

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

3. What do you think is the most important educational problem in this district? (If you think "lack of money" is the most important problem, please list the next most important problem.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. What do you think would be the best, most realistic solution to this problem?

_____

_____

_____

5. From the list below, select two of the most important things that a principal in this district could do to increase support for his school. (Remember, only check two choices.)

_____Explain school policies and programs through the P.A. or P.T.A.

_____Have community residents evaluate the school regularly

_____Have parent-teacher workshops to discuss school problems

_____Encourage parents to visit classrooms

_____Hold informal monthly coffee hours with parents

_____Have community residents advise on curriculum

_____Have an open class day once a month

_____Have a school newsletter

_____Establish good personal relations with community leaders

_____Hold parent orientation meetings at the beginning of the school year

_____Other; please describe: _____

_____

_____

6. Please read the following statements. Circle the number at the right of each statement that describes how much you think the Workshops have improved your skill, knowledge or understanding in each area.

1 = A lot
2 = Somewhat
3 = A little
4 = Not at all

	A lot	Somewhat	A little	Not at all
1. My understanding of the problems of the schools in this district	1	2	3	4
2. My skill in finding out the causes of educational problems in this district	1	2	3	4
3. My ability to weigh different sides of a question in order to find a workable solution	1	2	3	4
4. My understanding of racial and ethnic problems in education	1	2	3	4
5. My understanding of the idea of "accountability"	1	2	3	4
6. My understanding of reasons for breakdowns in communication between school and community	1	2	3	4
7. My knowledge of ways to improve cooperation between school and community	1	2	3	4
8. My knowledge of ways in which schools can increase their responsiveness to the community	1	2	3	4
9. My ease and confidence in talking to other people who have different points of view	1	2	3	4
10. My understanding of the problems facing community representatives	1	2	3	4
11. My understanding of the problems facing principals	1	2	3	4
12. My understanding of the role of the Community School Board	1	2	3	4
13. My ability to find ways to help solve educational problems	1	2	3	4
14. My understanding of the problems facing teachers	1	2	3	4
15. My understanding of the problems facing parents	1	2	3	4
16. My ability to compromise and agree with others on solutions to specific educational problems	1	2	3	4

7. Suppose the following situation occurred:

"A Community School Board decided to start a new program in the schools. The Community School Board then sent out an announcement of the new program, and described its objectives and budget. A group of community residents suggested that another program was better and should be used instead. A group of principals in the district recommended still another program."

From the list of statements below, choose the one statement that describes what the COMMUNITY SCHOOL BOARD would be most likely to do. Indicate your response by putting an M (most likely) on the line next to the statement. Then, choose one statement that describes what the COMMUNITY SCHOOL BOARD would be least likely to do, and indicate your answer by putting an L (least likely) on the line.

_____ Try out all three programs in a few schools
_____ Examine all three programs and decide which one to use
_____ Use their own program
_____ Use the principals' program
_____ Use the community's program
_____ Use their own program and try out the principals' program in a few schools
_____ Use their own program and try out the community's program in a few schools
_____ Meet with the other two groups to defend their decision
_____ Meet with the other two groups to work out a compromise

Reread the above situation. From the list below, choose the one statement that describes what the PRINCIPALS would be most likely to do (M). Then choose the statement that describes what the PRINCIPALS would be least likely to do (L). Indicate your response by putting an M for what the Principals would be most likely to do. Put an L on the line to show what the Principals would be least likely to do. Use the following list:

_____ Suggest that all three programs be tried out in a few schools
_____ Examine all three programs and decide which one to work for
_____ Agree to use the Community School Board's program
_____ Work for the use of their own program
_____ Work for the use of the community's program
_____ Agree to use their own program and try out the community's program in a few schools

8. In each of the areas below, decisions must be made. Read each statement and decide which one group should have major responsibility, which two groups should have some involvement, and which two groups should have little involvement in making decisions in each area. Please select groups only from this list:

Community School Board
Parent Groups
Students
Principals
Teachers

CHANGING THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM:

Which one group should have major or primary responsibility _____

Which two groups should have some involvement _____

_____

Which two groups should have little involvement _____

_____

DETERMINING HOW THE DISTRICT'S MONEY WILL BE SPENT:

Which one group should have major or primary responsibility _____

Which two groups should have some involvement _____

_____

Which two groups should have little involvement _____

_____

DETERMINING CHILDRENS' EDUCATIONAL NEEDS:

Which one group should have major or primary responsibility _____

Which two groups should have some involvement _____

_____

Which two groups should have little involvement _____

_____

REMOVING TEACHERS:

Which one group should have major or primary responsibility _____

Which two groups should have some involvement _____

_____

Which two groups should have little involvement _____

_____

EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS:

Which one group should have major or primary responsibility _____

Which two groups should have some involvement _____

_____

Which two groups should have little involvement _____

9. Overall, in which areas, or with what kinds of issues was the Community-School Relations Council most successful? (Please try to be specific.)

10. In which areas was the program least successful?

11. What suggestions do you have for improving the program?

12. Would you recommend this Program to a friend?

1. No
2. Yes, if he were paid to attend
3. Yes, even if he were not paid to attend

13. What is the best way of building good school-community relations in this district?

APPENDIX IV

The participants were asked to rate how much the program had improved their skill, knowledge or understanding in each of the areas listed below, by circling a number from one to four in the column at the right of the questions. This table gives the percentages of the participants choosing each response.

	A Lot (1) %	Some-what (2) %	A Little (3) %	Not At All (4) %	DK %
My understanding of the problems of the schools in this district	64	24	12	0	
My skill in finding out the causes of educational problems in this district	36	39	15	6	6
My ability to weigh different sides of a question in order to find a workable solution	58	30	9	0	3
My understanding of racial and ethnic problems in education	52	33	9	3	3
My understanding of the idea of "accountability"	64	27	3	6	
My understanding of reasons for breakdowns in communication between school and community	52	30	12	3	3
My knowledge of ways to improve cooperation between school and community	33	49	15	0	3
My knowledge of ways in which schools can increase their responsiveness to the community	49	42	6	0	3
My ease and confidence in talking to other people who have different points of view	67	27	6	0	
My understanding of the problems facing community representatives	46	42	12	0	
My understanding of the problems facing principals	42	27	21	6	
My understanding of the role of the Community School Board	36	33	18	9	3
My ability to find ways to help solve educational problems	52	42	3	3	
My understanding of the problems facing teachers	52	36	12	0	
My understanding of the problems facing parents	76	18	3	0	3
My ability to compromise and agree with others on solutions to specific educational problems	64	18	18		

Appendix A

Results of Scientific Differential Exercise
for total group of respondents

	Generally Imag. Center	Group Deci-sion Making	Trends in Ed. Dist.	Educational Change	Professionals
OPEN-CLOSED					
Pretest Mean	2.2	2.6	3.5	4.0	3.8
Posttest Mean	2.0	2.5	3.4	3.6	3.7
COLORFUL-COLORLESS					
Pretest Mean	2.5	2.3	3.0	3.9	4.2
Posttest Mean	2.4	2.4	3.2	3.7	3.3
WISE-FOOLISH					
Pretest Mean	1.8	2.1	3.4	3.0	3.0
Posttest Mean	1.7	2.5	3.1	3.5	3.6
EFFECTIVE-INEFFECTIVE					
Pretest Mean	2.1	2.3	3.8	3.6	3.4
Posttest Mean	2.6	2.0	3.8	4.3	3.9
HARD-SOFT					
Pretest Mean	4.5	4.4	4.1	3.9	3.9
Posttest Mean	4.3	3.7	4.4	3.7	4.3
HOT-COLD					
Pretest Mean	3.3	3.1	4.4	3.9	4.3
Posttest Mean	3.0	3.4	4.2	4.0	4.2
STRONG-WEAK					
Pretest Mean	2.7	2.9	4.2	3.9	3.3
Posttest Mean	2.5	3.0	4.3	3.9	3.9
FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY					
Pretest Mean	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.5	2.9
Posttest Mean	1.7	2.3	2.6	3.5	4.1*
INTERESTING-BORING					
Pretest Mean	1.7	1.6	2.6	2.5	2.8
Posttest Mean	1.7	1.9	2.9	2.7	3.4
FAIR-UNFAIR					
Pretest Mean	1.9	1.8	3.2	3.3	3.2
Posttest Mean	1.9	2.0	3.1	3.6	4.3*

*Significance at .01 level or above

Results of Semantic Differential Exercise
for Total Group of Respondents

	Comm. School Relations	Parent Involvement	Parapro-fessionals	Account-ability	Children in This District
OPEN-CLOSED					
Pretest Mean	3.7	4.0	2.9	3.8	3.0
Posttest Mean	4.1	3.3	3.0	4.2	2.3
COLORFUL-COLORLESS					
Pretest Mean	4.2	4.3	2.7	3.5	3.0
Posttest Mean	3.9	3.8	3.1	3.8	2.1
WISE-FOOLISH					
Pretest Mean	3.5	3.25	2.5	3.1	3.9
Posttest Mean	3.5	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.2
EFFECTIVE-INEFFECTIVE					
Pretest Mean	4.2	3.5	2.5	3.1	3.9
Posttest Mean	3.9	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.0
HARD-SOFT					
Pretest Mean	3.5	4.0	3.9	3.4	3.5
Posttest Mean	3.9	3.6	4.1	3.6	3.0
HOT-COLD					
Pretest Mean	4.0	3.8	3.5	4.0	3.4
Posttest Mean	4.0	3.6	3.6	4.2	3.5
STRONG-WEAK					
Pretest Mean	4.3	4.2	3.0	3.9	3.8
Posttest Mean	4.2	4.0	3.1	3.4	3.4
FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY					
Pretest Mean	3.6	2.9	1.9	3.5	2.8
Posttest Mean	3.8	2.9	2.6*	3.7	2.6
INTERESTING-BORING					
Pretest Mean	3.1	3.0	2.2	2.6	2.7
Posttest Mean	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.3
FAIR-UNFAIR					
Pretest Mean	3.5	2.8	2.4	3.0	2.9
Posttest Mean	3.9	3.1	2.6	3.6	2.8

*Significance at .01 level or above